

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5, 10-13, 30, 32, 33, 35 and 36 presently appear in this case. No claims have been allowed. The official action of January 4, 2006, has now been carefully studied. Reconsideration and allowance are hereby respectfully urged.

Briefly, the present invention relates to DNA sequences encoding a protein capable of binding to TRAF and which comprise a nucleotide sequence of any of SEQ ID NOs:4, 5 or 6 or a sequence that is degenerate as a result of the genetic code for those sequences.

The examiner has slightly revised the restriction requirement, but maintains that claims 14-29, 31, 32 and 34-44 are withdrawn from consideration as are the subject matter of claims 1-13, 30 and 33 which are not drawn to the nucleotide sequence encoding IREN.

Claims 14-29, 31, 34 and 37-44 have now been deleted. It is urged, however, that generic linking claims are now present in the case as the claims have been amended so as not to read on the prior art, and the three sequences remaining share a significant structural similarity. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement and action on the full scope of all of the claims remaining in the case are respectfully urged.

Appln. No. 10/070,255
Amdt. dated July 5, 2006
Reply to Office action of January 4, 2006

Claims 4, 5, 9-13, 30 and 33 have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot form the basis for further multiple dependencies.

All of the claims have now been amended to correct all improper multiple dependencies, thus obviating this objection.

Claims 1-3 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite as referring to nucleotide sequences depicted in the figures. The examiner suggests an amendment to recite the sequence by SEQ ID NO would be corrective.

The claims have now been amended to insert SEQ ID NOs, disclosed at page 19 of the specification. Accordingly, this rejection has now been obviated.

Claims 7 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 7 and 8 have now been deleted, thus obviating this rejection.

Claims 6-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 6-8 have now been deleted, thus obviating this rejection.

Appln. No. 10/070,255
Amdt. dated July 5, 2006
Reply to Office action of January 4, 2006

Claims 6-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C.
§102(b) as being anticipated by Wallach.

Claims 6-8 have now been deleted, thus obviating
this rejection.

It is submitted that all of the claims now present
in the case fully comply with 35 U.S.C. §112 and fully define
over the references of record. Reconsideration and allowance
are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /rlb/
Roger L. Browdy
Registration No. 25,618

RLB:rd
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\I\in12\Wallach28\PTO\2006-07-05AmendB.doc